(Proceedings in open court)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Case 19 C 6332, NHC versus Centaur Construction.

THE COURT: Hi.

MS. MARZIANI: Good morning, Your Honor. Gini Marziani on behalf of the plaintiff.

MR. WATTERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Zac Watters also on behalf of the plaintiff.

MR. GAVRILOS: Good morning, Your Honor. Constantine Gavrilos on behalf of defendants and third-party respondents.

MS. HERRING: Kim Herring on behalf of the same.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I think is all up on the agenda today, and it's what they used to call in Illinois a bedsheet ballot because it's as long as a bedsheet. So we've got, there is a handful of issues from this joint status report that was filed on June 17th, a couple or three.

There is some lingering issues from the order that I entered on Friday, I think five points that I wanted to raise with you from that order relating to the five different subjects that are in there.

Then there is a couple of recent motions that I haven't dealt with yet, that's docket number 435, motion to extend liens, some of which have already extended, but not all of them, and 436, motion to extend time to complete discovery.

And then it's relatively obvious to me that my

brilliant plan for limiting the amount of times I was going to see you and how much stuff got filed was a complete miserable failure. So we're going to just chuck that and go back to the drawing board. So we'll do that last.

It worked in the two other times that I've done that in 25 years. But, you know, if I am batting two out of three, that's probably pretty good.

All right. So on the status report, starting off with that, that's docket number 428, I'm just going to -there are five topics, yeah, five or six topics, really five,
I would say five in the plaintiff's section which are
responded to in the defendants' section.

So the first is Spiro Tsaparas and Peter Alexopoulos
Missing Documents. I am told in the response in the
defendants' part of that that we turned over copies of the
sale of the yacht. We produced photos of the vehicles and the
firearms. And then there is one item that Mr. Tsaparas lost
while traveling and he filed something with TSA on that.

So my take on that is that the issue raised in plaintiff's section called "Spiro Tsaparas and Peter Alexopoulos Missing Documents" is basically there is nothing more for me to do.

Do you think there is anything more for me to do?

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I may? I think the
answer is no, but if I can get give little bit more context.

THE COURT: You had me going there for a second. 1 MR. WATTERS: 2 I've discussed this with counsel. We received a forwarded email that purported to send us the 3 4 photographs and the TSA information. We never actually 5 received the underlying documents. We thought it was an 6 Outlook glitch. That's been a few weeks. We were told we 7 were going to get copies. We never did. 8 Having said that though, Your Honor, in light of the 9 Court's ruling on the motion for turnover, I don't know that the photos are terribly relevant. 10 11 THE COURT: It doesn't matter at this point, okay. 12 Fair enough. 13 Do you want to add anything more on that? 14 MR. GAVRILOS: I don't think anything needs to be 15 added. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. GAVRILOS: Other than we did send it again. Ι 18 didn't hear any follow-up. But I guess if they're not 19 receiving it, we don't need it. 20 THE COURT: In item 2, "Corri McFadden Missing 21 Documents," I think the plaintiff's section says they got 22 produced and you're reviewing them. 23

So do you think that you got what you asked for, what I ordered? It's the unredacted copies of the bank records and the so-called Notes document. Bottom of page 1, top of page 2

24

25

```
1
    of the status.
 2
             MR. WATTERS: Yes.
             MS. MARZIANI: We still don't have the unredacted
 3
 4
    copy of the William Alexopoulos Trust.
 5
             THE COURT: No. That's the next issue.
             MS. MARZIANI:
 6
                            Okay.
 7
             MR. WATTERS: Yeah, with regard to Ms. McFadden, Your
 8
    Honor, to the best of my knowledge we have what we need.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             MR. WATTERS: We'll of course raise it again with
11
    Ms. McFadden and her counsel if there is an issue.
12
             THE COURT: Okay. Next has to do with the thing that
13
    Ms. Marziani just mentioned, the trust document.
14
             So if I'm understanding it right, the issue is there
15
    is two William Alexopouloses, and you are not sure which is in
16
    the thing.
17
             MS. MARZIANI:
                            There may be more than two, but there
18
    is certainly two.
19
             THE COURT: At least two. Okay, all right. And I'm
20
    sure I've got all this stuff somewhere, but is this a
21
    reference in the body of the trust or is it the grantor or is
22
    it whatever they call the person who establishes the trust?
```

MS. MARZIANI: It's referenced in the body of the

THE COURT: It's not a long document.

trust. It's not that long.

23

24

```
MS. MARZIANI: Well, it's 71 pages. But there is not
 1
 2
    that many pages worth.
 3
             THE COURT: And the reason you don't know which
 4
    Mr. Alexopoulos it is, what is it that you think is blacked
 5
    out or whited out or blacked out that prevents you from
    figuring out which Alexopoulos it is?
 6
 7
             MS. MARZIANI: The date of birth.
 8
             THE COURT: The date of birth, okay.
 9
             MS. MARZIANI:
                           And you had specifically ordered that
10
    in that situation you should provide, I think it was --
11
             THE COURT: The year.
12
             MS. MARZIANI: -- the year. And we don't, we don't
    have it.
13
14
             THE COURT: Okay. Can you do that?
15
             MR. GAVRILOS: Yeah, we can do that. I was under the
16
    impression that was done when we turned over the re-redacted
17
    with black redactions instead of white. But I have the years.
18
    I can just give that to counsels in 5 seconds.
19
             THE COURT: Do that.
20
             MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, may we go back to one
21
    other point on the photographs?
22
             THE COURT: Where the guy is standing to your left,
23
    who is on your side, said it's okay now?
24
             MS. MARZIANI:
                            I know.
25
             THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to get that in
```

there.

MS. MARZIANI: Thank you.

Perhaps if they just gave us hard copies, I'll walk over to their office and pick them up, of the photographs. It just seems as though we should have those.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MARZIANI: Especially if they were emailed to us twice. And if that's a problem, like I said, I can walk over and pick them up.

THE COURT: Do you know what the nature of the attachment is, because sometimes there is --

MR. GAVRILOS: Less than 20 photographs.

THE COURT: No. But is it a JPEG or is it --

MR. GAVRILOS: The first time I believe it was JPEG.

The second time I believe it was by a secure link upload called Egress that our firm uses from time to time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GAVRILOS: Sometimes it automatically converts to that if the threshold of the file size warrants it. It did not in this case. But we send one of those anyway. If she wants hard copies, I can't imagine that being an issue.

THE COURT: Good, fine, do that.

Centaur Construction Company Missing Documents. So hang on one second. I've just got to refresh my memory.

So the end of the plaintiff's section says, more or

1 less, there is deficiencies, we're going to file a motion.2 The end of the defendants' section says, We've produced

3 everything there is.

And I haven't gotten a motion, so I'm just going to keep my mouth shut on that one. So, you know, if you want to file something, file something.

MR. WATTERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Category 5, EDrop-Off Chicago LLC Missing Documents. And the plaintiff's section of the status report says that as of June 17th, EDrop-Off has notified that they've produced all responsive documents that they have.

The defendants' section notes this little naming issue, whether it's EDrop-Off Express or EDrop-Off Chicago.

But nobody has asked, raised an issue for me to decide there, so I'm just going to kind of get past that one.

Then the sixth category is the law firm citation.

And the last things says you were going to keep talking about that. So what's the current status of that?

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, we had a meet and confer with counsel per the Court's direction. And what counsel suggested was that in lieu of a document production, a declaration by the firm's general counsel be provided. We said we'd consider it, review it. We've received no such declaration.

THE COURT: When are you planning to turn that over?

4

9

21

25

MR. GAVRILOS: As soon as the records all come 2 together. As Your Honor might imagine, there has been a 3 couple of entities who have chipped in, and we are putting all of that together. 5 THE COURT: Okay, okay. MR. GAVRILOS: And because of the declarations of 6 7 completeness that accompany this, I think it's reasonable --8 THE COURT: If I were to put a deadline on it, which I'd like to do just to have it done, tell me what a reasonable 10 date would be. 11 MR. GAVRILOS: Two weeks from today. 12 THE COURT: There you go. Two weeks from today, 13 whatever the affidavit is that's coming from Amundsen Davis, 14 Amundsen Davis. I got it right the second time. 15 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, can I just make a quick 16 request? Because there is a chance here that this 17 affidavit -- and to be clear, the information in the 18 declaration or affidavit is going to be exactly the same --19 there is a chance that instead of it coming from Amundsen 20 Davis's general counsel, it actually comes from Spiro Tsaparas instead --22 THE COURT: Whoever it comes from --23 MR. GAVRILOS: -- is the Court okay with whoever 24 signs on the affidavit as long as the information --

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, at some point somebody may

1 or may not raise an issue regarding the sufficiency of it.

 $2 \parallel \text{But I just want to get to that step.}$ So whatever affidavit is

3 going to be submitted in response to the citation to Amundsen

Davis is to be turned over, you don't have to file it with me,

5 be turned over by two weeks from today, which would be the

6 | 29th of this month.

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, just for purposes of the record, counsel had indicated that that affidavit may come from their client. It's not a hundred percent clear to me how their client is able to bind the firm. But we'll certainly consider it and raise any issues with the Court. I just wanted to make sure that we're clear that we're reserving our rights.

THE COURT: Okay. Understood.

Okay. So I think, I mean, there was some other stuff in the status report about expiration date, but that's all covered by other things. So I think I'm kind of done with the status report now.

So the next set of issues has to do with follow-up from the order that I entered last Friday, one second, which I had here a minute ago. Here it is.

Okay. And I had I think one or two questions on each of the little sections. I have my own answer to the first two questions, but I just wanted to just cover it.

So on the first two sections regarding

- Mr. Tsaparas -- and by the way, I just noticed this morning as I was re-reading this that there were a couple places where it said "Ms." not "Mr." I'm going to fix that. You know, unfortunately spell check doesn't catch all of those things.

 All of the references are supposed to be Mr. Tsaparas, obviously.
- Anyhow, the order speaks for itself. My assumption was that I don't have to enter some sort of separate order relating to that because there is no particular form that a court order has to take. And I've directed Mr. Tsaparas what he has to do in here.
- So if somebody thinks that I need to enter some separate kind of order, tell me now.
- MR. GAVRILOS: Yes, Your Honor, the defendants would ask for one clarification. But I'll let the plaintiffs go first if they have anything else.
 - THE COURT: Do you need to anything?
- MR. WATTERS: Not from our perspective, Your Honor. But of course we'll respond to whatever counsel raises.
 - THE COURT: Yeah, okay.
- MR. GAVRILOS: So, Your Honor, Mr. Tsaparas would ask for clarification on one specific issue. And I guess the windup to that is, this order as I understand, it confirms the 15 percent garnishment of Mr. Tsaparas's wages. It then confirms the additional 25,000 monthly payment.

THE COURT: You are reading that correctly.

MR. GAVRILOS: And the clarification we would ask is what, if anything, is Mr. Tsaparas allowed to use his money on? You know, for instance, is he allowed to pay for a babysitter? Is he allowed to pay his attorneys' fees? Is he allowed to pay for groceries?

This order would suggest that he's not necessarily allowed to use his money for anything whatsoever, which would pose some practical problems in the immediate future.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to say something?

MR. WATTERS: Yes, Your Honor. I think the language of the statutes is clear. No, he cannot start dissipating assets for whatever reason he wants, whether it's for a babysitter, hotel trips, airline flights, all the things that were mentioned in the motion for turnover.

What I think makes sense practically speaking is if Mr. Tsaparas or any of the other judgment creditors want to seek permission for certain expenses, they can do that in writing before the Court and we'll respond to it.

But to try to hammer out what types of payments he's allowed to make right here right now just doesn't seem very practical or useful.

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, we did do that, you know, by way of the monthly expense memorandum. And I don't think the outcome of what expenses on the memorandum were

permissible were quite identified. Moreover --

THE COURT: I wasn't asked to do that. But I'll get to that in a second.

Are you going to have this same issue with regard to the turnover?

MR. GAVRILOS: With Peter Alexopoulos, we are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's the same issue, yeah, okay.

MR. GAVRILOS: And I guess, you know, not in a sense to be, you know, semantic or nitpicky, but just the simple fact that it seems like any time they do anything with their money whatsoever they're at risk of being held in contempt.

And while I think the defendants have made their position known with respect to how the citation statute deals with that particular issue, the result of this order might suggest that any time they use their money at all, they could be held in contempt.

And we'll reserve, you know, the rest of that for when we move through this order.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, so, I mean, I had a request, and this is true with respect to both of the two individual judgment debtors, Mr. Tsaparas and Mr. Alexopoulos, I had a request before me from the plaintiff saying they've violated their obligations. That warrants this additional form of relief, namely, these monthly payments. I concluded that was

warranted.

I had granted on Mr. Tsaparas, because the proceedings had gone back quite a bit further, I had a decent amount of additional information from him regarding what his income and outgo was on a monthly basis. You no doubt noted that I think the request was \$40,000 a month. I did not order that. I ordered \$25,000 a month.

And respectfully, I was not asked in the several submissions that were made to say, Okay, you can spend this and you can't spend that. I was asked -- and I wasn't called upon to do that. And I'm not going to wing that. I'm just not going to wing that. That would be lunacy on my part.

I mean, if I can just speak from a 30,000-foot level and not, you know, not taking away from amending, revising, correcting anything that's in the order, you know, part of what's going on here is that when somebody violates a court order, there are consequences to it.

And I've concluded that this is what the consequences should be. And it's kind of like, and I don't want to draw this analogy too much, but it's kind of like, you know, when somebody, which as you guys know, federal judges do both civil and criminal cases, it's a pretty common occurrence for somebody who has committed a crime and is found guilty or pled guilty to committing a crime, and they've got to get sentenced, they come in and they say, Well, this is going to

hurt my wife, it's going to hurt my kids, it's going to hurt me. Like, yeah, and to part of that the answer is you should have thought about that before you broke the law.

So I'm not telling Mr. Tsaparas where he gets the money. I'm not -- he can go out and borrow it from a rich relative or he can borrow it from a bank. He can get it out from under his mattress if there is anything under his mattress. He can pay it from his, you know, ongoing income if he wishes to do that.

Part of the reason that I -- part but not all of the reason why I had the thing in there for both of these gentlemen about filing these monthly expenditures and income and asset reports is to get a sense of what it's doing.

I mean, to my way of thinking, if this had been done according to Hoyle from the get-go, on Mr. Tsaparas's side what would have happened is there would have been a discussion when the citation got served saying, okay, here is what I've got. Here is what is coming in. Let's sit down and try to work out some sort of, some sort of this is what goes on my side of the line, this is what goes on your side of the line.

That didn't happen. People did what they were going to do. People did what they did. And now there is a consequence to it. So I know that's not a direct answer to your question, but --

MR. GAVRILOS: Can I make it a little bit more

broadly then, Your Honor?

THE COURT: The briefing schedule, in the briefing that was done, both of these guys, I wasn't asked to do what you are asking me to do right now, and I'm not going to do it today.

MR. GAVRILOS: Okay. Can I ask it a little more broadly then? Instead of what specifically they might be able to spend their money on, my question then is, is the Court of the opinion that they can spend their money on anything whatsoever?

THE COURT: You know, what you are -- how many filings are there in this case for crying out loud, post-judgment filings? There is like several hundred of them, okay. So I'm not going to operate that way. Nobody has had a problem filing stuff in this case and on either side. Nobody has had a problem filing stuff in this case. And that's not a question that is before me, okay.

The question that was before me was, there were citations to discover assets, there were expenditures that were made, this goes back several, you know, rulings and hearings, did those expenditures run afoul of the citation, the restraining provisions of the citation? I concluded they did. Then we've been dealing with the consequences of that, and that's the question before me.

I am not going to today and maybe not ever, but

certainly not today, sit down and say, Okay, he can spend \$4.78 for a Starbucks, but he can't spend, you know, \$6.50 for an Intelligentsia. Or he can spend, you know he can get a babysitter, but he can only pay him 15 bucks an hour as opposed to 18 bucks an hour. I'm not going to do that.

You know, that's my answer. And I'm just going to hold my tongue at that at this point. We're going to move on to the next thing.

So the question on the table is do I need to enter any kind of a separate order that embodies what's in the order already? On that the question is for defendants.

I mean, there is a paragraph in the order on page 3, it's actually, yeah, it's the paragraph in the order on page 3 which basically is what Mr. Tsaparas has been ordered to do. There is a similar one on page 8 regarding Mr. Alexopoulos. It's a paragraph in the middle of the page on page 8.

To my way of thinking, I don't need to do anything other than that. If anybody thinks I need to, tell me now.

MR. GAVRILOS: Well, assuming we're treating Peter as a separate issue in a section under, you know, this status report, so just to keep it together --

THE COURT: I got to have a yes or no.

MS. HERRING: We have some issues to raise as it relates to Mr. Alexopoulos.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MS. HERRING: So with Mr. Tsaparas, we're okay. THE COURT: Okay. The issue is do I need to have --2 okay. What is the line from the old -- serenity now. 3 If you look up "serenity now," you'll get a 4 Seinfeld line. YouTube cut. 5 6 The single thing that I am asking for an answer to is 7 do I need to put in a separate piece of paper that is entered 8 on the docket as a separate docket item the order that is 9 already on for Mr. Tsaparas, page 3, and for Mr. Alexopoulos, 10 page 8, of the entry of the order that I entered last Friday, 11 the 12th of July? Yes or no. 12 You guys said no. 13 You say yes or no? 14 MR. GAVRILOS: So Tsaparas, no. Alexopoulos, yes. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Why on Alexopoulos? 16 MR. GAVRILOS: For Mr. Alexopoulos, Your Honor, I 17 guess it's just -- and to be clear for the record, you know, 18 the order with respect to Peter Alexopoulos was that his 19 monthly payment is \$10,000 per month. 20 I guess my question as it pertains to 21 Mr. Alexopoulos, given that the financial information that we 22 produced up until this point indicates that \$10,000 is --23 THE COURT: You are going to tell me he doesn't have it? 24 25 MR. GAVRILOS: What happens when he inevitably is

unable to make these payments, because it's about 25 percent of his yearly income.

THE COURT: Okay. That one I kind of figured I was going to hear today.

So short answer is I can't tell you. I mean, whether that, you know, whether somebody is going to come and say he's not doing it, that's a further contempt, you should now do something more severe, potentially people would have that option. And if that happens then, you know, the arguments would probably be along the lines of we don't have -- they banned debtors prisoner in Anglo-American jurisprudence a few centuries ago. We shouldn't do that now. I'm being slightly facetious there, but you get my point.

Or that, you know, for more severe sanctions for contempt, there has to be some level of wilfulness, intent, maliciousness, whatever you want to call it, and not having money doesn't count as that. But I think that's respectfully another issue for another day if and when that doesn't happen.

I don't know, the guy could hit on the Pick 6 tomorrow as far as I know. Is it Pick 6 or is it Pick 5? Whatever it is, he could hit on it tomorrow, or he could go out to the riverboat and, you know, start hitting 21s, you know, 15 times in a row or whatever.

I think that's an issue for another day. I mean, the legal framework that it would fall within is, okay, is

somebody going to ask me to impose a further sanction for contempt or whether it's contempt on top of contempt or whatever you want to call it, and if they do, then, you know, people will make arguments that I shouldn't do it, and then I have to decide what if anything more I should do.

Again, part of the reason -- and I know what I was told regarding what Mr. Alexopoulos's current income. Part of the reason for these monthly what I'll call, you know, financial statements is so that I -- part of the reason, but not all of the reason is so that I can see what is there, because those are going to be submitted under oath. And I assume, I'd like to assume that even in this day and age that has some sort of a meaning to people.

So that's my answer. I know it's a nonanswer. It's the best I can do for you right now.

MR. GAVRILOS: Nothing further to that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm not going to enter a separate order on those two because I think it's already covered in there.

Item number 3, Ms. McFadden. I think I gave you a couple of extra days to get me the draft order on that. So actually we don't need to talk about that.

And so then the last two things on the July 12th order would be --

MR. GAVRILOS: Turnover of personal property.

THE COURT: -- the turnover of the vehicles and the guns. I certainly agree with you, I certainly agree with you that the prospect of having the plaintiff turn over the gun to the defendant is probably something we would all like to avoid. I'm actually sure -- I'm actually not sure -- there may be some legal issues about that.

And you can't bring them into the courthouse. I mean, I can't act as the intermediary on that. I just think you need to kind of figure out a way to do it.

I will say this, I mean, I don't know if these, you know, if somebody has got like the actual James Bond gun that was used or something, but probably these guns don't have a whole lot of value. And I get that you are allowed to collect what you want and whatever. But, you know, one option here was to say, Ah, we don't need that stuff.

But I think in terms of the turnover of the guns, I think you should try to work something out, and I'm hoping that you can figure out a mechanism to do that that doesn't involve me having to make another order. So I'm going to give you some time to do that and figure it out.

And I think there is firearms with respect to both of them if I'm reading everything correctly.

MR. WATTERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You know, so I know what the street value is because I get cases like that all the time. The street

1 values are pretty tiny, a hundred bucks, 150 if it's a really 2 nice one. 3 So then that leaves these, there is a trailer I quess 4 and -- hang on a second. So I've got on Mr. Tsaparas --5 MR. GAVRILOS: The trailer was for Mr. Alexopoulos, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Alexopoulos, you're correct. 8 MR. GAVRILOS: And I can maybe provide a little bit 9 of detail. THE COURT: Go for it. 10 11 MR. GAVRILOS: You know, we had quite limited time to 12 get as many background facts on the trailer as we could. 13 can provide a make and model. 14 THE COURT: When you say "trailer," that can mean a 15 bunch of different things. What is it? 16 MR. GAVRILOS: That's exactly where I was going with 17 this. So the trailer in this case, it's difficult to 18 describe, but imagine, you know, like the trailers that hold 19 landscaping equipment that you often see pulled around --20 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, yeah. 21 MR. GAVRILOS: -- the white ones with like 22 essentially what looks like pressboard, you know, interior 23 walls. This is that. It's about half that size. 24 THE COURT: Kind of like an old style U-Haul except

25

without a top on it or something?

```
MR. GAVRILOS: More or less, yes. I would say
 1
 2
    slightly more rudimentary than that. It's just used for
 3
    physical transport.
             THE COURT: Yeah.
 4
 5
             MR. GAVRILOS: And I can give you --
 6
             THE COURT: Is it something that's been used kind of
 7
    for landscaping type stuff?
 8
             MR. GAVRILOS: It's used more in connection with this
 9
    sportsman resource endeavor.
10
             THE COURT: Okay.
11
             MR. GAVRILOS: To transport some of his tools of the
12
    trade there.
13
             THE COURT: Okay, all right.
14
             MR. GAVRILOS:
                            Is Your Honor's position on the
15
    trailer the same as it was with respect to the firearms,
16
    figure it out?
17
             THE COURT: People can decide not to take whatever
18
    they decide not to take. But I think you should just kind of
19
    figure out how to get this stuff.
20
             MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I think the Court's earlier
21
    instruction regarding the photos will help move this along.
22
    So we will pick up the photos, gather some --
23
             THE COURT: Once they see what it looks like, that
24
    will make it easier, I think.
25
             MR. GAVRILOS:
                            Sure.
```

THE COURT: Okay. So then on --1 2 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, at the top of page 10 of 3 the Court's order on Friday --THE COURT: There it is. 4 MR. WATTERS: -- there is the issue with the Chevy 5 6 Suburban. 7 THE COURT: Yeah, so that's the one where as I said 8 the ball is in NHC's court. And the question is whether the 9 remainder of the wild card exception, the \$2400 remaining from 10 the wild card exception covers the value of it. Do you know? 11 MR. WATTERS: Well, Your Honor, we went ahead and ran 12 a Kelley's Blue Book report using the VIN. 13 THE COURT: Right. 14 MR. WATTERS: So without the mileage or condition, 15 we're making some educated guesses here. But given the VIN, 16 and assuming 100,000 miles and it being in good condition, the 17 value is somewhere between 21,926. So quite a bit more than 18 the 2400. 19 THE COURT: And is this the one that has a loan on it or not? 20 21 MR. WATTERS: This one, our understanding at least as 22 of last year was that it does have a loan on it. 23 THE COURT: Does have a loan. 24 MR. GAVRILOS: And, Your Honor, it's our 25 understanding that is loan around \$30,000.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: That would be the norm for most vehicles.
They end up being worth way less than you think.
                                                  The day
after you buy them, they are worth like $10,000 less than you
paid for them.
         MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I may make a suggestion?
         THE COURT: Yeah.
         MR. WATTERS: Along with the photos, if we could get
documentation on the current status of the loan, I believe,
and Ms. Marziani can correct me, I think the last
documentation we had was over a year ago, correct, for the
loan balance?
         MS. MARZIANI: Right.
         MR. WATTERS: I mean, no one is looking to waste time
and resources.
         THE COURT: Yeah.
         MR. WATTERS: So if the value of the loan greatly
exceeds the value of the vehicle, we can make a reasonable --
         THE COURT: Judgment about what to do?
         MR. WATTERS: Yes. So if we could get that
information as well, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: That seems to make sense to me.
         Does that work for you?
         MR. GAVRILOS: It makes sense to me as well, Your
Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay, good.
```

permitted.

So let's see, well, this actually goes back to things you were talking about a second ago. And since we're on Mr. Alexopoulos, let's stick with Mr. Alexopoulos.

So I'm looking at page 10 of the order.

Mr. Alexopoulos made an assertion November 23 that he asserts the balance of his wild card exemption as to any and all remaining items of personal property to the fullest extent

So really what that boils down to is, without knowing what the value of the trailer and the firearms is, it's really kind of hard to tell what that is. I can't adjudicate it. To the extent I have to adjudicate anything, I can't do it. So do you have some input on that?

MR. GAVRILOS: No, Your Honor. And that was essentially our position at the time. Remember, that exemption was claimed back in November of '23, at which point there was no motion to actually turn over the vehicle. And so it was unclear what the balance of the loan obligations that would have potentially offset the value, you know, would be at the time turnover was actually sought.

THE COURT: So you are basically telling me that that's going to flow from what comes out of the Suburban issue?

MR. GAVRILOS: Essentially.

THE COURT: Yeah. That makes sense. That sounds

```
right to me.
 1
             MR. WATTERS: I think we just need to gather
 2
 3
    additional information about the assets, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: Okay.
 5
             MR. GAVRILOS: And that's agreed.
 6
             THE COURT: That makes sense. Okay, do that.
 7
             So now we're back over to -- it was actually earlier
 8
    in the order. Oh, it's the last section of the order. It has
 9
    to do with --
10
             MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I may?
11
             THE COURT: Yeah.
12
             MR. WATTERS:
                           Before we jump to what I think is sub
13
    point 6 in the order on page 11 --
14
             THE COURT: Did I skip something?
15
             MR. WATTERS: Well, we've got multiple vehicles that
16
    there is no exemption claimed for on Mr. Tsaparas.
17
             THE COURT: Right, yes, exactly. That's
18
    Mr. Tsaparas. That's what I was looking for.
19
             MR. WATTERS: Correct.
20
             THE COURT: I skipped over that.
21
             MR. WATTERS: It's bottom of 10, top of 11, Your
22
    Honor.
23
             THE COURT: I was looking right at it. There it is.
24
    Okay. And we talked about a couple of these the last time.
25
    We talked about, I recall talking about the Ducati and the
```

Lancia and trying to figure out what they were.

MS. MARZIANI: That was April 23rd.

THE COURT: Okay. It was a couple months ago. Fair enough.

Okay. So what I concluded on that was that Mr. -- and there is a typo that I'm now just noticing at the top of page 11, which says, "With respect to Mr. Alexopoulos's statutory exemptions," it should say "Mr. Tsaparas."

MS. MARZIANI: Yes.

THE COURT: So I'll fix that one too.

MS. HERRING: Yes.

THE COURT: He asserted the motor vehicle exemption on the different vehicle, a BMW. He asserted his wild card exemption on other stuff. So basically all we're talking about at this point is how the vehicle -- just table the firearms for a second because you are still talking about those -- how the vehicles get delivered and disposed of. And this is the Ducati, the Lancia, and the Denali, D-E-N-A-L-I.

So do you have a thought or proposal on that, Mr. Gavrilos?

MR. GAVRILOS: I believe, and I forget which hearing we discussed these vehicles, I think the conclusion that we came to was that the vehicles, aside from the one that Mr. Tsaparas is claiming, are essentially scrap metal. So our response would be similar, you know, to what we've been saying

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But we

```
all along with respect to the vehicles. If that's something
that NHC wishes to compel turnover of, I don't know that we
would object to that because we did not in our original claim
                And so --
for exemptions.
         THE COURT: The Denali is scrap metal?
         MR. GAVRILOS:
                       Well, the Denali I think was under the
Alexopoulos property.
         MS. MARZIANI:
                       No.
         MS. HERRING:
                       None of -- no.
         MR. GAVRILOS:
                       Okay. And then yes, it's our
understanding that none of those cars work, that, in fact,
they may not even have an engine.
         THE COURT: What do you need to know on those?
         MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, may I? Mr. Tsaparas
testified that he drives the Ducati all the time, except in
inclement weather.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MS. MARZIANI: And that he had paid off the loan, so
there is no loan on it.
         THE COURT: Okay.
                        It's a 2017 Ducati. I don't know
         MS. MARZIANI:
anything about motorcycles, but --
         THE COURT: Oh, that's the motorcycle, that's right.
         MS. MARZIANI: Yeah. The Lancia, Mr. Tsaparas at his
```

citation examination testified that it's not running.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

asked for pictures of it because we talked about how it was, I don't know, it's a special car to him. THE COURT: It's not clear what it is, yeah. MS. MARZIANI: We didn't know what it was. So I think the Lancia falls into that category of we need pictures. We don't know what that is. The 2015 Yukon Denali, Mr. Tsaparas at his citation examination testified that he drives it all the time, that Mr. Alexopoulos drove it from Niles, Illinois to Aspen, and that's a vehicle that Mr. Tsaparas drives all the time. So the only one of those three vehicles, the only one that isn't operable based on Mr. --THE COURT: Is the Lancia? MS. MARZIANI: Right. And we just -- there is no claim for exemptions. I would think that the way to handle it, but we could talk about it amongst ourselves, would be that Mr. Tsaparas delivers the vehicles to a professional and we sell the vehicles if we're able to sell them. MR. WATTERS: Just to clarify, Your Honor --THE COURT: You say "a professional," like to somebody who sells cars? MR. WATTERS: Right, a private sale, Your Honor, as opposed to the sheriff. MS. MARZIANI: Like CarMax, yeah. THE COURT: Yeah.

```
MS. MARZIANI: We would not want the sheriff or the
 1
 2
    marshal selling it. That would not make sense.
 3
             THE COURT: That would be extraordinarily unwise --
             MR. WATTERS: Yeah.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: -- to have the marshal sell it. You'd
    get less for it anyway.
 6
 7
             Mr. Gavrilos, what are your thoughts?
 8
             MR. GAVRILOS: Yeah, Your Honor, that's my apologies,
 9
    I think I confused the Lancia with the Ducati.
10
             THE COURT: Ducati is a motorcycle.
11
             MR. GAVRILOS: Sure. Yeah, Your Honor, the exemption
12
    claim I think was for the BMW.
13
             THE COURT: Yeah.
14
             MR. GAVRILOS: I don't know that the Denali was -- is
15
    that something that was even on Spiro's initial asset
16
    disclosure form? I mean, we're going back a little bit on
17
    that particular issue.
18
             THE COURT: All I know is it was in the motion that I
19
    dealt with.
20
             MR. GAVRILOS: I don't know, in other words, Your
21
    Honor, if that's something that can be turned over from Spiro.
22
    But if we're talking about the automobiles, it's certainly
23
    something that we can add to our to-do list discussion as to
24
    how to best dispose of that.
25
             THE COURT: So the turnover of it has been ordered,
```

okay. So that's a done deal.

So it's okay for you to discuss all of this, but just what I don't want to get and what I will not take is a whole boatload of more motions relating to this stuff. I mean, this is a discussion. There has been orders entered on all of these things. I'm talking about the collection of the stuff we've been talking about so far.

And there is a discussion about, you know, details of how things get transferred and in some situations details about what things are or what they, you know, what they're worth. But that's a status report, joint, and pretty soon, so two weeks. So I want a status report two weeks from today, which would be the 29th.

So in terms of remaining issues then, we've got a motion to extend time to complete discovery. Actually that one I just completely blanked on until this morning. So I've got to pull it up and look at it.

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may?

There was one other issue with regard to the motion for rule to show cause as to Mr. Tsaparas that was addressed in the Court's Friday --

THE COURT: Which is what?

MR. WATTERS: As Your Honor may have seen, we submitted consistent with the Court's instruction a proposed order to the proposed order inbox. Your Honor, practically

- speaking, in light of the filings by Mr. Tsaparas's counsel, I
 think a finding of contempt has essentially already been made.

 There have been --
 - THE COURT: Not essentially. It has been made, more than.
 - MR. WATTERS: Fair enough, Your Honor. So I think the only remaining --
 - THE COURT: Yeah, when I looked at this order, I said there is a lot of this stuff that just doesn't need to be in there. Is that where you were headed?
 - MR. WATTERS: Well, I think so, Your Honor. And I don't know that there needs to be further briefing on the issue. The question really is what is the remedy for the contempt.
 - THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. No. We're talking about two different things.
- 17 MR. WATTERS: I apologize, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: I'm sorry. There has been an earlier contempt filing, but this is the new motion.
 - MR. WATTERS: This is the newer one.
 - THE COURT: Okay. So look, you know, at the risk of being accused of being pedestrian about this, the way that a contempt typically but not always gets teed up, and this is the way you started to tee it up here, is a motion for rule to show cause gets filed. Oftentimes there is a response to

that.

The judge basically, and I'm oversimplifying this a little bit, the judge basically decides whether there is probable cause, okay. If so, the judge issues a rule to show cause. Then there is a contempt hearing. And that's kind of where we are heading. I've got to issue the rule to show cause. Then there is going to be a contempt hearing, at which the -- you know, obviously the burden -- well, not obviously.

Even though it's an order to show cause, the burden of proving contempt is always on the party seeking contempt, not on the party who would be held in contempt. But that party is entitled to present evidence, as is the party seeking the contempt finding, to determine what I should do about it. So this involves this 70,000ish additional transfers.

So we're not going to skip over anything. We're going to do it according to Hoyle or whatever the legal equivalent of doing it according to Hoyle is.

So I don't think I need all of the preliminaries here. It's really paragraph 2 of your draft order.

"Mr. Tsaparas shall show cause on or before" blank, and we'll fill in the blank in a second, "why an order should not be entered pursuant to" citations.

It would be, number one, finding him in the contempt and, number two, imposing an appropriate sanction for the contempt. I don't think you have to identify all of the

potential sanctions in the order.

So that's what I'm going to -- I'll just take what you've got and tweak it a little bit and get something entered on that.

MR. WATTERS: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But then the question would be how long do I give you all to file a response to the show cause order? So how long would you like?

MR. GAVRILOS: Can we take three weeks, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure, that's fine. That would be the 5th of August I think. Yeah, 8/5. So I'll just plug that in.

And then I'm going to give you all 10 days after that to reply, which would be the 15th of August. And then our next date will be the date that we do that in addition to anything else, which is really kind of the tail end of August I think.

Okay. So now I'm back to the motion to extend time to complete discovery, which is docket number 436, which I'm pulling up here.

Okay. So you've got -- so this is the laundry list.

Is this the other William Alexopoulos, so the first --

MR. GAVRILOS: I believe it's the senior, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's William Alexopoulos, the older. So it's written discovery request of William Alexopoulos, the elder -- is that how we'll will refer to him? It's subpoenas

on Mr. Pokorny and it's a law firm, right? 1 2 MR. WATTERS: Correct. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Pokorny and the law firm. 4 Number 3 is a subpoena to somebody named Susan 5 Krasick, who is the co-trustee of the Alexopoulos Trust, K-R-A-S-I-C-K. 6 7 And so you were looking for -- you said that there 8 was going to potentially be some more documents on the way. 9 Have you gotten anything since you filed the motion? 10 MR. WATTERS: We have not, Your Honor. We believe --11 THE COURT: Which of those folks do you represent, if 12 any of them? 13 MR. GAVRILOS: William Alexopoulos, the senior, and 14 Susan Krasick, I believe. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. GAVRILOS: And as to the first William 17 Alexopoulos, I'll just start with him because he's I guess a 18 direct respondent in the petition, we have discovery answers 19 out waiting for signature. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. GAVRILOS: You will recall William Alexopoulos is 22 the individual who is like north of 85 years old, does not 23 have a phone, computer, fax. It has been extraordinarily 24 difficult to communicate just on a base level. And so that's

25

essentially --

THE COURT: By the way, nobody has a fax. 1 2 MR. GAVRILOS: You would assume if you didn't have a phone or an email though that you might have a fax. 3 4 THE COURT: No. Actually the 85-year-old might be the guy that still had the fax. 5 6 Exactly, Your Honor, or a typewriter MR. GAVRILOS: 7 at least or something along those lines. 8 THE COURT: Right. 9 MR. GAVRILOS: Nothing. So it's taken a little bit, but we are working towards that. We expect to get those I 10 11 guess I'll say soon. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to put a deadline on it. So let's come back to that. 13 14 So who is Susan Krasick? She's the trustee of the --15 is this the same trust that we --16 MR. GAVRILOS: She's the daughter, Your Honor, 17 daughter slash brother. 18 THE COURT: And what were the documents that you 19 requested of her? Do you recall? 20 MR. WATTERS: I may have it, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: It's probably attached here somewhere. 22 MR. WATTERS: It would be Exhibit 3 to the motion, 23 Your Honor. And I apologize I didn't print all the exhibits. 24 Trying to save some trees. 25 THE COURT: I'm getting there. Exhibit 3, okay.

So basically it all has to do with the trust and the transfer of the home, it looks like, the transfer of the home to the trust. Okay.

So I was with you, Mr. Gavrilos. So what is going on with that?

MR. GAVRILOS: Susan produced all of the trust documents, which essentially represents everything responsive to the subpoena that she has. She was not -- and even if you look at the allegations of the petition, I don't think she's alleged to have done anything or taken any specific role.

THE COURT: Well, she's the named trustee or something like that?

MR. GAVRILOS: That's correct. I mean, I think really what it boils down to is I think she's a paralegal at the probate firm that handled this. So essentially, you know, she's the gateway.

THE COURT: Well, so I mean, you know, just consistent with the way we've done everything else, you know, in the latter stages in this case, if the response is she's produced everything that she has, she needs to provide some sort of declaration of completeness then.

MR. WATTERS: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. WATTERS: I was just going to say, just to be clear, it's my understanding, and again Ms. Marziani can jump

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in and correct me, she has produced two pieces of paper. THE COURT: Well, may be all she has. MR. WATTERS: It seems unlikely, but it's certainly possible, Your Honor. And I agree, if they are going to have her sign a declaration --THE COURT: I'm some sort of a trustee of some trust that my brother set up, and if I had to produce any piece of paper, I would not have anything. MR. WATTERS: Fair enough, Your Honor. THE COURT: And I'm a trustee. It probably means I'm a pretty bad one. But anyhow, so what we need within two weeks on that one is production of any remaining records, if there are any, and some sort of a declaration of completeness. So that's the 29th again. Okay. So that leaves -- now I've got to go back to the motion. So what were you trying to get from the Pokorny law Where does he fit in? Did he represent somebody here at some point in time or what? MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, they handled, if you recall --THE COURT: I don't. That's why I'm asking. MS. MARZIANI: Right. The trust was amended after the lawsuit was filed to exclude William -- I'm sorry, Peter

```
1
    Alexopoulos.
 2
             THE COURT: Pokorny did the amendment?
 3
             MS. MARZIANI:
                            Right, not only did -- right.
             THE COURT: Okay.
 4
             MS. MARZIANI: So he did the amendment.
 5
                                                       The
    paralegal happens to be the --
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Ms. Krasick works for him?
 8
             MS. MARZIANI:
                            Right. And so it just seems --
 9
             THE COURT: The documents, you are just looking for
10
    the documents, and they're either in one place or the other.
11
             MS. MARZIANI: Right. It seems somewhat odd that she
12
    being --
13
             THE COURT: But you don't represent Pokorny?
14
             MR. GAVRILOS:
                            That's correct.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. So what I need to do, if they
16
    don't represent Pokorny, what I need to do is issue some sort
17
    of order to show cause on Pokorny and the law firm.
18
             MR. WATTERS: And we're happy to file the motion,
19
    Your Honor, or do it orally right now.
20
             THE COURT: You don't need to. Just give me an
21
    order --
22
             MR. WATTERS: Understood, Your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: -- you know, basically saying why they
24
    shouldn't be held in contempt for failure to respond to the
25
    subpoena that was served on them. So just draft an order.
```

MR. WATTERS: We'll prepare the order, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. Then the last thing is motion to extend, which is 435. So a couple of them I think that I have done already. Those were the two individual judgment debtors.

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I think I can help short-circuit it if the Court would like.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. WATTERS: So at 435, I think the Court's ruling on Friday takes care of quite a bit of what was asked for with regard to the judgment debtors and the associated citations to the banks.

I think what we have outstanding that's requested in the motion is the citations and the associated liens with regard to Cori McFadden, EDrop-Off and William Alexopoulos, the senior, both individually and as a trustee.

And we'd ask that just to keep it consistent, Your Honor, we extend those through January 31st.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not comfortable extending those quite out as far. And the reason, I mean, this should come through from the order, the reason for the extension, at least the length of the extension on the two judgment debtors has to do with what I've concluded were violations of the citation. I don't think that as of right now I'm not prepared to say that anybody else has violated anything, at least to that

extent, and maybe in some cases not at all.

You know, I assume where we're headed on the William

N as in "Nancy" Alexopoulos situation is, is somebody going to
ask to undo the transfer of the home or something like that?

MR. WATTERS: It's certainly a possibility, Your Honor. We're waiting on documents.

THE COURT: Yeah. And so I guess my question is, and I think I know the answer, but I would rather have you tell me, what does that have to do with whether the citation should be extended? So what are you trying to avoid happening by extending the citations?

MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, besides the home and that petition, William Alexopoulos pays Peter Alexopoulos monthly. And we haven't -- we haven't dug into it. It's not a lot, but they pay him monthly amounts. And it's intertwined in your orders on the \$10,000 a month, and I think that will all come out.

We had suggested in our motion to extend that it be extended to September 12th, sometime after the Labor Day holiday.

THE COURT: Okay. So the father is giving money to the son and, therefore, what at least potentially? That's my question.

MS. MARZIANI: I believe that the father is violating the citation, yeah.

1 THE COURT: By giving money to the son. Oh, I see 2 what you are saying, because he has a citation served on him. MS. MARZIANI: Yes, right. 3 THE COURT: Okay. You've probably just exceeded my 4 5 colloquial understanding of what third-party citations do and 6 don't do. 7 MS. MARZIANI: He should be paying, it should be paid 8 to --9 MR. GAVRILOS: Hold on, Your Honor. If I can just 10 quickly respond there. I mean, just to be clear on --11 THE COURT: No. I want to make sure she finishes the 12 point. 13 So the point is that, I mean, what a third-party 14 citation does, let's say my courtroom deputy clerk has a 15 judgment that she owes, and I owe her money. The effect of 16 the third-party citation would be I pay the money to you --17 MS. MARZIANI: Exactly. 18 THE COURT: -- or hold on to it at least, but I don't 19 pay it to her. 20 MS. MARZIANI: Yes, exactly. 21 THE COURT: Okay. And so the idea would be that if 22 Mr. Alexopoulos, Senior -- and I know he's not a senior and a 23 junior here -- if Mr. Alexopoulos, Senior owes money to 24 Mr. Alexopoulos, Junior, then he shouldn't be paying that. Не 25 should be paying it to you.

MS. MARZIANI: Yes.

THE COURT: So then I'm going to ask you a follow-up question. If on the other hand what this is, and I know we're not talking about a teenager here, but dad, his son is in kind of dire straits, so he's giving him money to live on, does that run afoul of the citation? It wouldn't, right, because he didn't owe the money, except maybe in some moral sense?

MS. MARZIANI: Except that Peter Alexopoulos

MS. MARZIANI: Except that Peter Alexopoulos testified at his citation examination that he does work for William Alexopoulos --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MARZIANI: -- and that that's why he's getting the money, and that it's on and off and --

THE COURT: Okay. So you've got an argument for why it may be owed. Okay. I get what you are saying.

Now go ahead.

MR. GAVRILOS: Sure. So, you know, we can brief Mr. Alexopoulos' citation examination if need be. I know we're trying to avoid that. But it's my recollection that Mr. Alexopoulos testified he does work for his parents.

THE COURT: This is the judgment debtor Alexopoulos?

MR. GAVRILOS: Correct, correct. Peter Alexopoulos
testified that he often does work for William Alexopoulos and
his mother. Sometimes they give him a couple hundred bucks a
month. Peter Alexopoulos testified that it's not an

employment arrangement, that he would do the work even if he wasn't getting paid. And sometimes his parents give him money even when he doesn't do anything. We're talking stuff like taking out the trash.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. GAVRILOS: You know, they're 85 years old.

And so our understanding of the citation restrictions is that it restricts the disposition of money that is subject to citation, i.e., the judgment debtors's money.

THE COURT: Money that's owed to the judgment debtor.

The judgment debtor's money or money that's owed to him.

MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.

THE COURT: And the contention is going to be that they didn't know any of this.

MR. GAVRILOS: This is neither the judgment debtor's money nor money that is owed to the judgment debtor.

THE COURT: Okay. I get it. I think I understand kind of what we're talking about now.

MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, may I add one --

THE COURT: No. Here is what we are going to do.

This has all got to be brought to a head at some point. You are going to have to fish or cut bait on this thing. I'm not going to extend this for six months. I'm not going to extend it for three months. You know, it's fish or cut bait time.

And, you know, you've taken the examination of the

individual. You've taken the examination of the son too. And so, you know, you've got to file something. You've either got to file something or decide that you're not going to, and it's time to do that. So I'm going to give you three weeks to do that.

MS. MARZIANI: That's fine, Your Honor. We'll do that.

THE COURT: And so I'm going to extend the citation by four weeks, because I'm giving them three weeks to do that. And I'm not making any adjudication about what is happening, what has been happening is good, bad or indifferent. I just want to have it in effect.

So three weeks, that's the 5th of August. So you have got some stuff due on the 29th of July. We've got some stuff due on the 5th of August.

Okay. So that's William Alexopoulos.

Now we've got -- hang on one second. I've just got to look at one thing.

That last one is McFadden/EDrop-Off. Actually, no.

The heading on the motion or the first paragraph of the motion doesn't mention EDrop-Off. It just says McFadden, US Bank and Busey Bank. But I think Busey Bank may be Mr. Alexopoulos or maybe Mr. Tsaparas.

MS. MARZIANI: UC Bank is Mr. Alexopoulos.

THE COURT: Okay. So my question on Ms. McFadden --

I'm just pausing to formulate the question here. Okay. So I've made an order on that. I know it's got to get papered. And that's the thing that's coming in in a couple of days.

What else is there to deal with with regard to McFadden? I mean, once that order is entered, which is going to get entered probably Thursday, or Wednesday or Thursday on the order that -- as a follow-up from the July 12th order, what more is there to deal with on her?

I mean, you are going to get a judgment that directs her to turn over \$751,058.07. So what's left on McFadden? Why do I need to extend on these citations?

MS. MARZIANI: The reason is Ms. McFadden has been making payments and taking payments from Mr. Tsaparas. And so the citation, we believe, should be extended to, liens should be extended to the January date just as well as the Mr. Tsaparas one. Any money that she, any money that --

THE COURT: Let me go about this in a different way.

You answered the question I asked. But the question I asked
was not a good question. It wasn't what I intended to ask.

So once I enter this judgment against Ms. McFadden and in favor of NHC that directs her to turn over the 750 and change, what is going to happen after that as it relates to Ms. McFadden? You are going to have a judgment that says: McFadden, pay me money.

She is presumably not going to write you a check or

```
1
    just hand you a bag of cash. So what is going to happen after
 2
    that?
 3
             MS. MARZIANI: We'll take the next steps to enforce
    the judgment.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Which is what? It's a citation, right?
 6
                            Well, that would be my suggestion,
             MS. MARZIANI:
 7
    record the judgment and issue a citation against her
 8
    individually, yes.
 9
             THE COURT: Which is the citation that you are asking
10
    me to extend is against her individually. Why is it
11
    different? That's my question.
12
                            The difference is is that one is a
             MS. MARZIANI:
13
    third-party citation and one is a judgment debtor citation.
14
             THE COURT: So the third party, and I'm just talking
15
    this through, the third-party citation says anything that you
16
    have that is the property of or is owed to the judgment
17
    debtor, give me. The individual citation says give me
18
    everything basically --
19
             MS. MARZIANI: Yes.
20
             THE COURT: -- except for whatever exemptions there
21
    are.
22
             MS. MARZIANI: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: That's the difference, okay.
24
             MS. MARZIANI: And one gets satisfied, you know, when
```

the judgment is -- we're talking about 700,000, 750, whatever.

25

THE COURT: But doesn't, the second one, the broader 1 one, the individual citation, doesn't it kind of subsume the 2 3 other one? 4 My question is why are we going to need the extend 5 the citation, the third-party citation now that I am going to 6 be entering a judgment on it if you are going to as a result 7 of that judgment then serve a citation on her that's an 8 individual citation and, therefore, broader, covers 9 everything. 10 It may sound like a dumb question, but I'm --11 MS. MARZIANI: None of your questions are dumb. 12 THE COURT: No, I'm just trying to figure this stuff 13 out is all. 14 MS. MARZIANI: Yeah. Well, two reasons. One is that 15 the judgment against Ms. McFadden is significantly smaller 16 than the judgment against Mr. Tsaparas. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MS. MARZIANI: Two, if you terminate the citation 19 against, the third-party citation against Ms. McFadden now, 20 she then is free to dissipate whatever money that she was 21 going to give Mr. Tsaparas --22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MS. MARZIANI: -- since she wouldn't be paying us. 24 THE COURT: I get that. I get that.

MS. MARZIANI: So, you know, those two issues I think

25

are significant. The judgment against Mr. Tsaparas is significant. She is his domestic partner. And, you know, I think it's important that it stay, especially given --

THE COURT: Okay. I get your point.

Let me hear from you.

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, I guess to your earlier point, the third-party citation seems superfluous in light of the looming direct citation.

THE COURT: Well, at least until it gets -- maybe not until a direct one gets issued.

MR. GAVRILOS: And to Ms. Marziani's point, I don't know that the third-party citation prohibits the contemplated action here. Again, the third-party citation is limited to the judgment debtor's assets, money owed to the judgment debtor, not funds that a domestic partner shares with her domestic partner on a day to day. That is not money that is owed to Mr. Tsaparas that should be restricted pursuant to the terms of a third-party citation.

THE COURT: Well, I guess -- hang on. My answer to that kind of might be it depends. I mean, nobody asked me to adjudicate exactly what the terms of the obligation are. But let's just assume it's the equivalent of a demand note, okay.

And let's just assume for purposes of discussion that Ms. McFadden doesn't have -- whatever assets she has is south of \$751,000. It may be that everything is owed to him, and

it's all subject to this, it's all going to be subject to this. And frankly, that's like the most likely outcome, unless she's got a lot of money that nobody knows about yet.

So it seems to me that what makes sense here is to extend the third-party citation for some finite period of time, and then eventually it's going to effectively I think get subsumed by whatever citation is likely to get served once the judgment is entered. You know, I don't know if there is a waiting period for serving citations or not, there may be, there may not be.

So I think that seems to me to be the best way to do it. So maybe I extend it for like four to five weeks or something like that.

What's the current -- when does it currently expire?

Do we know? I think I had them all on one day.

MS. MARZIANI: I believe it's the 19th.

THE COURT: Of this month?

MS. MARZIANI: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah, so it's this Friday. So what about that? I mean, I get what you are saying. But, I mean, if she owes \$750,000 to Mr. Tsaparas, and that's what the judgment is going to enter, and she doesn't have \$750,000, in theory, and I'm not saying this is what the adjudication will be, but in theory everything she got, everything she has is owed to him in one way or another.

And so it kind of cuts against the proposition I should just let everything expire and, you know, we all go on about our merry way until whatever point in time the citation gets issued on this judgment.

MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, if I may speak?

THE COURT: Hang on one second. I'm still with him.

What am I missing?

MR. GAVRILOS: Sure. I guess maybe part of the problem is the function of the fact that there is no note here. You know, there is really no parameters as to what collateral, you know, may have been contemplated or if this was ever even contemplated as a loan. But the point remains that --

THE COURT: Well, time out. So if Ms. McFadden wants to walk in here, climb up on a witness stand, put her hand up, take an oath and say that she testified falsely in the trial, God bless her. Okay. Then I'll make a referral to the U.S. Attorney's Office about somebody having committed perjury before me and having just admitted it. But she's testified under oath that these were loans.

I get that nobody has testified that there is a note. But there is no law that says there has to be.

MR. GAVRILOS: Sure, Your Honor. I guess the response to that is that I think her testimony, and perhaps this may be briefed further in the future if necessary, but I

think her testimony was the fact that they were loans to the business, that they were not loans to her as an individual. And that may have changed the dynamic of what is properly recoverable if it was a loan to the business as opposed to a loan to her as an individual. And that was the gist of our response in the status report as to how this should ultimately conclude.

This is something that we raised a couple of times in the previous hearings. But I think Ms. McFadden's position would be that to the extent that this was a loan, this was not a loan to her personally, that it was a loan to the business. And we thought that that was an issue that should have been potentially further explored.

THE COURT: Well, time out. Potentially further explored. Everybody has filed like gazillions of briefs in this thing. And you guys filed a brief in response to the motion for turnover order relating to Ms. McFadden. You did. You know, you've made those arguments. You've probably made them more than once as we went through.

I rule whenever arguments are made. My ruling may be right, it may be wrong. If it's wrong, that's something that you can take up with a higher authority at some point in time.

So for right now I'm extending the citation on Ms.

McFadden by an extra five weeks beyond when it expires now.

So that's to the 23rd of August.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what that means, here is what that means, that means I've got to get this order, the judgment order, which I'll try to get entered promptly, and then you are going to do whatever happens next. MR. WATTERS: Understood, Your Honor. MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, just a point. We can't enforce the judgment for 10 days. THE COURT: I know. MS. MARZIANI: And so --THE COURT: Five weeks is more than 10 days. is math. That's 35 as opposed to 10. Okay. So that gives, you, let's say the judgment doesn't get entered for three days, that gives you still 22 days to play with. So what else do we have to talk about today, important qualifier, that we have not already discussed? MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, there is one I think relatively minor issue with regard for the motion for turnover as to Mr. Tsaparas and the U.S. Bank accounts. It's motion --THE COURT: Is that the one I already ruled on? MR. WATTERS: You ruled on it with regard to Mr. Tsaparas. And we are not trying to retread on that ground. THE COURT: Yeah. MR. WATTERS: One of the requested forms of relief for it was the order for a turnover of \$17,311 that's

1 currently being held in --THE COURT: I thought I already entered something on 2 3 that. MS. MARZIANI: No. A different bank account. 4 That 5 was Busey Bank. 6 THE COURT: But I granted the motion, or I didn't 7 grant the motion? 8 MS. MARZIANI: You granted the motion with regard to 9 Busey Bank, not with regard to U.S. Bank. 10 THE COURT: All right. So give me a docket number. 11 What is the motion that we are talking about? 12 MR. WATTERS: The motion that we are talking about is docket number 351. 13 14 THE COURT: 351. All right. Motion for turnover 15 order for Spiro Tsaparas and U.S. Bank accounts. 16 MS. MARZIANI: Right. 17 MR. WATTERS: And then specifically, Your Honor, the 18 requested relief that we're talking about is made in 19 subparagraph 6 of the "wherefore," which is on page 9. 20 THE COURT: "Order that U.S. Bank turn over \$17,311." Didn't I enter a turnover? No. I entered a turnover on 21 22 Busey. 23 MS. MARZIANI: Busey Bank. 24 MR. GAVRILOS: No. Your Honor, I do believe you 25 ordered a turnover. This was in response to the turnover

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

motion that was filed against Mr. Tsaparas maybe in February. I think what we had concluded was that money that was frozen on the day that we entered into the agreed wage deduction back in November, and it has just been sitting there this whole time, you asked if we had any objections as to whether that money should be turned over. We said no. So it was our understanding that that money has already been subject to turnover. THE COURT: So I've just got to enter, what you are saying, I've just got to enter an order. Get me an order. MR. WATTERS: We'll submit a proposed order, Your Honor. THE COURT: Fine. MS. MARZIANI: Yes. THE COURT: So you can put them all in the same email. MR. WATTERS: Understood, Your Honor. THE COURT: Anything else you've got? MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I think the only thing -well, actually two things, Your Honor. I almost misspoke there. I'm happy to go into as much detail or as little detail as the Court would like. With regard to the other third-party citations, we've been in contact with citation

recipients or their counsel. Obviously no one has showed up

today because we've told them that we are working with them to gather answers and documents. We're entering and continuing those examination dates.

And then the only other issue, Your Honor, is how you want to proceed with regard to the next court date and filings related to the next court date.

THE COURT: Yeah, I know, I know we've got to talk about that. Is there anything, before I get to that, anything else that you've got?

MR. GAVRILOS: We do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So we have this one little glitch here, which is that we're not basically allowed to hold court the week of the Democratic National Convention because they think it's going to be chaos down here. I think they're wrong, but whatever, that's what they think.

And the 23rd is that, the 23rd of August, which is what I just extended this citation to, is that week. So I need to make that one more week just to cover it. So whatever I extended to the 23rd of August is going to be the 30th of August.

And so what I want to do is, I'm going to have you file a joint status report on the 15th of August. So that's two weeks before the date that we're going to have the status hearing, which is the 29th. But I think that one I'm just going to do by phone. Let me just be sure here. Yeah, we're

going to do that one by phone at 8:45 in the morning on the 29th of August.

So now we're to the how do I reconfigure everything. So the other times, the other two occasions over the 25 or so years that I've been here where I've had things where I said, Okay, I can only see you so much, I set all these dates and filing restrictions and whatnot. The purpose and actually the effect in those situations was to lower the amount of stuff that got filed.

I have no idea, of course, I don't have a control group here. My concern is that I increased the amount of stuff that got filed, because a lot of stuff got filed. And then I got the motion on the defense side saying: Time out. We've got this torrent of stuff here. We can't respond to it all within the time that you have set.

So we've got to do this in a different way. And I am vacating the order that has you coming in every two weeks or three weeks or whatever it is or month. That's just not going to work.

And I think what I am going to tell you is we are going to go back to normal. You file stuff when you want to file it, and I set it for a hearing when I think it ought to be set for a hearing, and I order a response when it gets filed, and we'll just do it that way.

So a failed experiment has been consigned to the ash

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

19

21

heap of history at this point. So there you go. MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor? THE COURT: Yeah. He said only two more things and he actually covered two. Does that mean he was wrong and it really three? I'm not giving her enough time to kick MR. WATTERS: me under the podium, Your Honor. I apologize. MS. HERRING: I've been trying really hard. I just wanted to mention that I am going to be out of the country starting on the 23rd. I don't need to be here on the 29th if you --12 THE COURT: It's just going to be a phone call. 13 MS. MARZIANI: Right. I'll just need --14 THE COURT: If we end up needing to do something in 15 person, it's going to end up being after that. 16 But I'll be in France. MS. MARZIANI: Okay. THE COURT: And so what he will tell me is that when 18 I go to set a hearing date, if I set it for a hearing when you going to be in France, he'll say, "She's going to be in France" and I won't set it. 20 MS. MARZIANI: No, no. You already set a hearing for 22 when I am going to be in France. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MS. MARZIANI: I just wanted to say I think that 25 Mr. Watters is fully capable of handling that hearing --

THE COURT: Okay. 1 MS. MARZIANI: -- without me. But in case there is a 2 3 question about something --4 THE COURT: Yeah, okay. 5 MS. MARZIANI: -- way back when, you'll know why --THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MS. MARZIANI: -- he's not here to --8 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks. Bye. 9 MS. MARZIANI: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 MR. WATTERS: 11 MR. GAVRILOS: Thanks. 12 (Proceedings concluded) CERTIFICATE 13 14 I, Jennifer S. Costales, do hereby certify that the 15 foregoing is a complete, true, and accurate transcript of the 16 proceedings had in the above-entitled case before the Honorable MATTHEW F. KENNELLY, one of the judges of said 17 18 Court, at Chicago, Illinois, on July 15, 2024. 19 20 /s/ Jennifer Costales, CRR, RMR, CRC 21 Official Court Reporter 22 United States District Court 23 Northern District of Illinois 24 Eastern Division 25